

REMARKS

The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22, 24-33, 35-37 and 39 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22 and 24-33 and 35-39 remain pending in the application.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based upon a combination of Watkins (US 5,305,483) in view of Hurley (US 2,826,244), and further in view of Frankenberg (US 4,326,310).

Claim 38 has been amended. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the remarks that follow.

Watkins does not teach or suggest a flexible laminated sheet material for covering a mattress, as defined in amended claim 38, comprising an air-permeable first layer and a substantially air-impermeable second layer that is laminated to one face of the first layer, that makes direct contact with the body of a person lying on the mattress, and that has a set of outlet air perforations. Watkins also does not teach or suggest means for directing the airflow from an air supply source through the first layer in a direction parallel to a surface of the second layer and transverse to the second layer through the outlet perforations in the second layer, such that the airflow through the air inlet displaces air from the first layer through the outlet perforations to circulate air through the first layer.

Watkins provides an infant bed with a mattress and a pillow with a lower plenum chamber and upper permeable foam layer. The pillow does not comprise a flexible laminated sheet material for covering the mattress, as defined in amended claim 38. It's a pillow, period. Furthermore, Watkins' pillow is, by purpose, made special. Watkins' special pillow provides an air flow, not shared by the mattress, to keep the head of the infant "in healthy repose" in the air flow coming only out of the pillow. Watkins does not teach, suggest, or contemplate air flow beyond the pillow and parallel to the body of the infant lying on the mattress. There is a reason for this. The placement of Hurley-like air channels, as the Examiner suggest, extending through and beyond the pillow across the infant bed mattress, would render Watkins' special pillow useless for its intended function. This is because the desired outflow of air only at the special location of the pillow would be no longer occur. Why would Watkins want to do that? The answer is that he wouldn't. The Examiner's proffered modification of Watkins is not taught, suggested, or contemplated by Watkins,

and the combination is justified only by hindsight using applicant's invention as a blueprint. Frankenberg adds nothing by way of incentive for Watkins to provide a laminated sheet material conducive to carry air flow beyond the special pillow region.

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks and allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 22 and 24-33 and 35-39 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

By


Daniel D. Ryan, Registration No. 29,243

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.

Post Office Box 26618

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226

(262) 783 - 1300

March 22, 2006

Customer No.: 26308

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal Letter
 Return Postcard